

## **REMARKS**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-18 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claim 19 is added herein.

Therefore, claims 1-19 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-18 are rejected.

Claim 2 is objected to.

Claims 1-10 and 12-18 are amended herein.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

### **OBJECTION TO THE TITLE**

In the Office Action, at page 2, the title was objected to as not being descriptive. In view of the new title set forth above, the outstanding objection to the title is resolved.

### **OBJECTION TO THE CLAIMS**

Various claims were objected to as having a typographical error. Correction has been made. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102**

In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, claims 1, 8, 12-14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Percy. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

**CLAIMS 1, 8, 12-14, AND 18: ANALYZING HOME PAGE CONTENT TO EXTRACT KEYWORDS AND CREATE TITLE THEREFROM**

Claims 1, 8, 12-14, and 18 recite automatically analyzing the contents of a home page to thereby identify and extract keywords. They also recite automatically creating a title from the extracted keywords. When, for example, creating, editing, or bookmarking a home page, it is now possible to automatically create a useful new title for the home page. Claims 1, 8, and 14 also recite that a user registers the home page and the title is added to the user's bookmark registration of the home page.

According to the Merriam Webster Online Dictionary, a "keyword" is a significant word from a title or document sometimes used as an index to content. The Free Online Dictionary of Computing indicates that a "keyword" is a small set of words designed to convey the subject of an article. One skilled in the art of computer technology reading the present claims will have a clear understanding of the meaning of "keyword" in the present claims. Furthermore, "contents" can be used to indicate "something contained -- usually used in plural <the jar's contents> <the drawer's contents>" (Merriam Webster Online Dictionary).

The rejection suggests that Peercy's Abstract discloses extracting keywords from a home page. Applicant respectfully submits that Peercy does not extract keywords in the sense of the word as discussed above. Each entry in Peercy's hotlist has a name or title, a URL, and a counter. Peercy does not disclose generation of a new title from extracted keywords. Peercy is completely silent on how the titles are obtained. Peercy mentions storing titles but not generating new titles. Peercy has no discussion of keyword extraction. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Although neither Peercy nor the rejection explain keyword extraction and title generation therefrom, the following discussion assumes that Peercy gets its titles from the titles of hotlist pages themselves. The example titles in Figure 2 appear to be the exact title of corresponding URLs. In other words, they are titles such as would be obtained from the "<TITLE>" tag of a home page. Although a title may coincidentally have a keyword in it, obtaining such a title is not a result of the recited operation of analyzing the contents of a home page to thereby identify and extract "keywords". One skilled in the art would differentiate between getting an old predefined title from a home page and generating a new title from extracted keywords.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

None of the prior art reveals that there is a problem with home page titles or that

generating new titles based on page content is desirable.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103**

The independent claims were rejected as obvious. In the Office Action, at pages 4-5, claims 3, 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Peercy in view of Li. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested. At page 5, claims 4, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Peercy in view of Sweet. At page 6, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Peercy in view of Cheng. At pages 6-7, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Peercy in view of Kurapati. At page 7, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Peercy in view of Ernst.

The dependent claims are deemed patentable due at least to their dependence from allowable independent claims. These claims are also patentable due to their recitation of independently distinguishing features. For example, claim 2 recites a thumbnail. The thumbnail is created as part of a user registering a home page. The prior art does not generate a thumbnail when a user registers a home page (creating the user's bookmark for the home page). Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 09/766,567

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4 OCT 2004

By: James T. Strom  
James T. Strom  
Registration No. 48,702

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)**  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
on OCT 4, 20 04  
STAAS & HALSEY  
By: J. Strom  
Date: OCT 4, 2004